

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-9 are pending in the application. Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims define patentable subject matter.

Formal Matters

The Abstract is objected to as containing more than 150 words. By this Amendment, Applicant has amended the Abstract. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to remove the objection to the Abstract.

The drawings are objected to because the Examiner maintains that the block elements request descriptive labels. Applicant herewith submits a replacement drawing sheet with the changes suggested by the Examiner. Applicant thus respectfully requests the Examiner to acknowledge and accept the replacement drawings.

Claim objections

Claims 6, 7, and 10 stand objected to as being in improper multiple dependent form. Applicant respectfully submits that this objection is improper in light of the Preliminary Amendment filed on December 8, 2003, in which claim 10 was cancelled and claims 5 and 7 were amended to remove multiple dependencies. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to remove the objection to claims 6 and 7.

Claim rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Swank (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0113600) in view of Chasek (U.S. Patent No. 3,774,113).¹ Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 1-4.

With regard to independent claim 1, the Examiner asserts that:

The only differences between Swank and the claim is that the claim recites the step of connection at least one correction value with the second voltage to form a corrected second voltage, and forming the Voltage Standing Wave Ratio on the basis of the first voltage and the corrected second voltage in place of isolating the forward and reflected voltages and then converts them into a direct current (dc) signal and calculates the VSWR.

However, the Examiner cites col. 1, lines 62-67 of Chasek for allegedly “disclos[ing] a system similar to that of Swank and further disclos[ing] a step of correction for the purpose of enhancing the quality” and asserts that “[i]t would have been obvious to ... incorporate the step in the system.”

Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention would not have been rendered obvious in view of Swank and Chasek because the cited references do not teach or suggest “connecting at least one correction value with the second voltage to form a corrected second voltage”, as claimed.

Chasek relates to receiver parameter monitoring which occurs continuously while the receiver is in-service without interfering with normal operation of the receiver. One of the

¹ Applicant notes that the grounds of rejection only discuss claims 1-4 in detail. Further, claim 5 is objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would otherwise be allowable. Therefore, Applicant assumes that only claims 1-4 are rejected.

parameters Chasek monitors is a voltage standing wave ratio (VSWR). However, as discussed at col. 13, line 60 to col. 14, line 27 with reference to Fig. 15, Chasek merely discloses a VSWR monitoring system whereby a signal from a modulated white noise source 20 is connected through an attenuator 255 to a unidirectional coupler 256 where it passes directly through the receiver 226. This signal is then fed to automatic detection and indication system 30, and a value is output. This is the direct signal. Once a switch means 252 is transmitted, modulated white noise source 20 is rerouted through isolator 257 to coupler 256 and into the antenna 224, where it is reflected back through the receiver 226 and fed into automatic detection and indication system 30 and output. This is the reflected signal. The difference between these two voltages is then output to meter 242, and indicates the size of the VSWR. Chanek thus does not show a correction value. Nor does Chasek show a corrected second voltage which results from connecting the correction value with a second voltage.

Further, this deficiency of Chasek is not cured by Swank as admitted by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1, as well as dependent claims 2-7, should be allowable because the cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all of the features of the claims, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify Swank based on Chasek to produce the claimed invention.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.111
USAN 10/728,994

Q78379

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher R. Lipp
Registration No. 41,157

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 21, 2005

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. §1.111
USAN 10/728,994

Q78379

AMENDMENT TO DRAWINGS

Please replace Figure 1 with the attached revised Figure 1.

Attachment: 1 Replacement sheet.